



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/729,098

12/08/2003

Kia Silverbrook

BAL70US

8780

24011 7590 03/21/2008
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD
393 DARLING STREET
BALMAIN, 2041
AUSTRALIA

EXAMINER

LE, QUANG V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/21/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/729,098	Applicant(s) SILVERBROOK ET AL.	
	Examiner QUANG V. LE	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/08/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/113,057.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/08/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the application 10/729098 filed on 12/08/2003.
2. **Claims 1-26** have been examined and are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449 filed 12/08/2008 is attached to the instant office action.

Priority

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority PO 07986 under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon an application filed in 09/113,057 on 07/10/1998. However, a certified copy of PO7991 has not been received with application 09/113,057 as recited in the Oath declaration data sheet of this application. Therefore, this application is not entitled to the PO7991 priority. A claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) cannot be based on said application, since the United States application was filed more than twelve months thereafter.

Oath/Declaration

5. Receipt is acknowledged of PO7986 filed under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a)-(d) based on an application filed in 09/113,057 on 7/10/1998. Applicant has not complied with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.63(c), since the oath, declaration or application data sheet

recites a foreign application (PO7991) that has never been submitted with this application. A new oath, declaration or application data sheet is required in the body of which the present application should be identified by application number and filing date.

Claim Objections

6. **Claim 16** is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of claims 15 and 1 respectively. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim 16 includes these limitations : “The camera comprising at least one camera sensor, the processing system being adapted to manipulate the image in accordance with signals received from the camera sensor”.

Claim 1 by incorporating the limitations of claim 15 recites: “A handheld camera, said camera comprising: a sensor adapted to sense an image; an input for receiving predetermined data representing a respective form of data manipulation; and, a processing system, the processing system being adapted to: obtain the image from the sensor; and, manipulate the image in accordance with the predetermined data to thereby generate a manipulated image, the camera comprising a control input for selecting camera parameters, the processing system being adapted to manipulate the image in accordance with the selected camera parameters”

All the limitations of claim 16 are cited in claim 1 and 15.

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. **Claim 1, 2, 4, 11 and 12** of instant application are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of “obviousness type” double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, 8, 12 and 13 of copending application No. 10/729159.

Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of the 9159' application. Claim 1 of the instant application is broader in every aspect than the corresponding claims 1 and 6

of the 9159' application and is therefore an obvious variant thereof. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 2 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of the 9159' application. Claim 2 of the instant application is broader in every aspect than the corresponding claim 8 of the 9159' application and is therefore an obvious variant thereof. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 4 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of the 9159' application. Claim 4 of the instant application is broader in every aspect than the corresponding claim 8 of the 9159' application and is therefore an obvious variant thereof. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 11 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of the 9159' application. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 12 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 13 of the 9159' application. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

9. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 20, 22, and 24-26 of instant application are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of “obviousness type” double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,10, 12-19 and 21-24 of US Patent No. 7,187,404.

Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of the 7404' US Patent. Claim 1 of the instant application is broader in every aspect than the corresponding claims 1 of the 7404' Patent and is therefore an obvious variant thereof. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 2 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 10 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 4 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 5 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 13 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 6 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 7 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 8 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 16 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 9 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 17 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 10 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 18 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 20 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 19 of the 7404' US Patent. Claim 20 of the instant application is broader in every aspect than the corresponding claims 19 of the 7404' Patent and is therefore an obvious variant thereof. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 22 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 21 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 24 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 22 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 25 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 23 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 26 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 24 of the 7404' US Patent. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

While Applicant is permitted to be his own lexicographer, the term "Vark script" has not been claimed in a manner that apprises the public of the metes and bounds of the protection sought by Applicant. Applicant discloses, beginning on page 13 of the specification, that "Vark is a powerful image processing language especially developed for the Artcam unit." The specification proceeds to describe Vark using phrases such as, "Preferably, the Vark language is ..." and "Preferably, the language includes" Consequently, one of ordinary skill in the art would be unable to discern what, at a minimum, constitutes a Vark script and how to avoid infringing on the claim.

See MPEP §§ 2173.02, 2173.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2622

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-2, 13-16, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sarbadhikari et al. US Pat. No. 5,477,264.

As per claim 1, Sarbadhikari teaches a handheld camera comprising:

a sensor adapted to sense an image (col 4, line 3-4);

an input for receiving predetermined data representing a respective form of data manipulation (col 4, line 6-8 and col 5, line 26-30) (the user interface provides the input as cited in the claim);

and, a processing system , the processing system being adapted to (col 2, line 59-61): obtain the image from the sensor; and, manipulate the image in accordance with the predetermined data to thereby generate a manipulated image (col 4, line 6-8).

As per claim 20, this claim recites what was previously discussed in claim 1.

As per claim 2, Sarbadhikari teaches handheld camera as claimed in claim 1, Sarbadhikari also discloses the input comprising a card reader, the predetermined data being stored on a card (col 6, line 40-45). The read/write apparatus in the reference is the card reader as cited in the claim.

As per claim 21, this claim recites what was previously discussed in claim 3.

As per claim 13, Sarbadhikari teaches a handheld camera as claimed in claim 1, Sarbadhikari also discloses said sensor **12** (fig. 2) being adapted to generate a CCD Image, said processing system being adapted to convert the CCD image into at least one of an internal image(col 6, line 8-10) and a print image (col 4, line 6-9, "Images are captured by the sensing section **1a** in the camera **1**, manipulated in the processing section **1b**, stored on the memory card **3**, and transferred from the card **3** to the computer **4**"). It is know in the art that a manipulated image is an image ready to be printed.

As per claim 14, Sarbadhikari teaches a handheld camera as claimed in claim 13, Sarbadhikari also discloses said processing system **20** (fig 2) bring adapted to manipulate at least one of the CCD image, the internal image and the print image (col 4, line 6-9).

As per claim 15, , Sarbadhikari teaches a handheld camera as claimed in claim 1, Sarbadhikari also discloses the camera comprising a control input for selecting camera parameters (col 7, line 44-47), the processing system being adapted to manipulate the image in accordance with the selected camera parameters (col 5, line 11-14).

As per claim 16, Sarbadhikari teaches a handheld camera as claimed in claim 15, Sarbadhikari also discloses the camera comprising at least one camera sensor **12** (fig. 2), the processing system **20** (fig 2) being adapted to manipulate the image in accordance with signals received from the camera sensor(col 4, line 6-9).

As per claim 18, Sarbadhikari teaches a handheld camera as claimed in claim 1, Sarbadhikari also discloses the camera further comprising a display adapted to display said manipulated image (col 10, line 55-63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. US Pat. No. 5,477,264.

As per claim 3, Sarbadhikari teaches a handheld camera as claimed in claim 2, Sarbadhikari also teaches the captured images are manipulated with the processing stored in the memory card (col 4, line 6-9). This manipulation can be in the form of a

script file (col 11, line 8). This script file has similar function as the VARK script file described in the specification.

Therefore, to one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use either script files, since applicant has not disclosed that the VARK script file solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well.

13. Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Dutton et al. US Pat. No. 4724307.

As per claim 4, Sarbadhikari teaches a handheld camera as claimed in claim 2, but Sarbadhikari fails to explicitly disclose that the card reader is a card drive system.

However, Dutton et al teaches a card reader comprising a card drive system for driving the card along a card path (col 6, line 43), and a card sensor positioned along the card path (col 5, line 65-68).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Dutton card reader system into Sarbadhikari camera so as to provide a camera system that allows the user to scan a card into the camera without using a PC. Such camera can be used as a rental camera and the customer can pay by scanning the credit card through the camera.

As per claim 11, Sarbadhikari and Dutton teach a handheld camera as claimed in claim 4, Dutton further discloses that the card reader comprising a card insertion sensor, the processing system being responsive to the card insertion sensor to activate the card drive system (col 5, line 55-57 and col 6, line 51-54, "The presence or absence of a card **10** to be read may be detected by a light source and photocell").

14. Claims 5-8 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari as applied to claim 20 and Sarbadhikari and Dutton as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Drexler US Pat. No. 5,241,165.

As per claim 5, Sarbadhikari and Dutton teach a handheld camera as claimed in claim 4, but they fail to disclose that the predetermined data being disposed on a surface of the card, the input being adapted to read the predetermined data disposed on the card surface.

However, Drexler teaches the predetermined data being disposed on a surface of the card, the input being adapted to read the predetermined data disposed on the card surface (abstract: "The data card also contains permanently stored prerecorded information in the form of surface contours or photographic marks... Both sets of data,

the laser written and the prerecorded, may be read and viewed simultaneously without interfering with each other”).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Drexler prerecorded card into Sarbadhikari and Dutton camera system since it is known in the art that preloaded non-image data on image card is conveniently useful since the users don't have to install them from different media.

As per claim 6, Sarbadhikari, Dutton and Drexler teach a handheld camera as claimed in claim 5, Dutton further discloses the card sensor extending across the width of the card path, the processing system being adapted to activate the card sensor and the drive system to thereby detect the predetermined data as the card moves with respect to the card sensor (col 6, line 46-51).

As per claim 22, this claim recites what was previously discussed in claim 4 and 6.

As per claim 7, Sarbadhikari, Dutton and Drexler teach a handheld camera as claimed in claim 5, Dutton further discloses the card sensor comprising an illumination source and an optical sensor, the processing system being adapted to activate the

illumination source and the optical sensor to thereby read the predetermined data (col 5, line 57-61).

As per claim 23, this claim recites what was previously discussed in claim 7.

As per claim 8, Sarbadhikari, Dutton and Drexler teach a handheld camera as claimed in claim 7, Sarbadhikari further discloses the processing system being adapted to: determine a card image in accordance with signals received from the card sensor; selectively rotate the card image (col 11, line 3-5); and, convert the card image to determine the predetermined data (col 6, line 5-9) .

As per claim 24, this claim recites what was previously discussed in claim 8.

15. Claims 10 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari, Dutton, Drexler as applied to claims 8 and 24 above and further in view of Chida et al. US Pat. No. 5,524,194.

As per claim 10, Sarbadhikari, Dutton and Drexler teach a handheld camera as claimed in claim 8, but they fail to disclose the processing system being adapted to convert the card image by: decoding the card image to determine a decoded card

image data; converting the decoded card image into byte data; unscrambling the byte data to determine the predetermined data; and, performing error detection.

However, Chida teaches a camera with a video interface unit that encodes and decodes the image signal and also performs error detection (col 4, line 59-63)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Chida decoding and error detection method into Sarbadhikari, Dutton and Drexler camera system since it is known in the art that encoded data is safe and secured.

As per claim 26, this claim recites what was previously discussed in claim 10.

16. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. and Dutton as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Soltesz et al., US Pat. 5,756,978.

As per claim 12, Sarbadhikari and Dutton teach a handheld camera as claimed in claim 4, they fail to disclose the camera comprising an ejection input, the processing system being adapted to activate the card drive system to thereby eject the card in response to activation of the ejection input.

However, Soltesz discloses a sale terminal that has an eject key **38** that ejects the optical card from card reader **1** upon activation (col 6, line 6-9).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Soltesz card ejection system into Sarbadhikari and Dutton camera system with card reader since it is known in the art that a card reader has to have an eject function so the card can be removed at user command.

17. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Slater US Pat. 5,243,370.

As per claim 17, Sarbadhikari teaches a handheld camera as claimed in claim 16, Sarbadhikari fails to disclose the camera sensor comprising a camera orientation sensor.

However, Slater teaches a sensor for sensing the orientation of the camera in his camera stabilizer system (col 10, line 8).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Slater orientation sensor into Sarbadhikari camera so as to provide a camera that senses its orientation so it can display the images in their proper orientation regardless of camera's position.

18. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Suzuki US Pat. 5,847,836.

As per claim 19, Sarbadhikari teaches a handheld camera as claimed in claim 18, Sarbadhikari fails to disclose wherein said display device comprises a printer device adapted to print said manipulated image.

However, Suzuki discloses a printer-built-in camera (col 4, line 11-12).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Suzuki built-in printer into Sarbadhikari camera system so as to provide camera that can conveniently print out an image immediately after the image is captured.

Allowable Subject Matter

19. Claim 9 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon their rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 9, no prior art could be located that teaches or fairly suggests a handheld camera with card image that selectively rotates in accordance with the skew of the card with respect to the card sensor.

Regarding claim 25, no prior art could be located that teaches or fairly suggests a method of selectively rotate an image card in accordance with the skew of the card with respect to the card sensor.

Conclusion

20. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Taggart; Robert B. et al.	(US 3893173 A) Miniaturized magnetic card reader/recorder for use in hand-held calculator
Alasia; Alfred V.	(US 4092654 A) Encoding system
Kitahara; Sigeyosi et al.	(US 4244006 A) Control device for television camera
Inoue; Manabu et al.	(US 4728978 A) Photographic camera
Griffin; Hugh	(US 4897719 A) Image pre-processing sub-system
Lemelson; Jerome H.	(US 4991205 A) Personal identification system and method
Nakajima; Takatsugu	(US 5016112 A) Combined video recorder and camera with superimposition of video and data
Schneider; Howard	(US 5115888 A) Self-serve checkout system
Fukuoka; Hiroki	(US 5754227 A) Digital electronic camera having an external input/output interface through which the camera is monitored and controlled
Stephenson; Stanley W.	(US 5909248 A) Exposure control of camera attached to printer electronic camera
Bilbrey; Brett et al.	(US 6020931 A) Video composition and position system and media signal communication system
Hieda; Teruo et al.	(US 6278486 B1) Information signal controlling system

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang V. Le whose telephone number is (571) 270-5014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor David Ometz can be reached 571-272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David L. Ometz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2622

Quang Le
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2622